

REMARKS

The office action of February 6, 2007, has been carefully considered.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over JP 9-57,401 in view of the patent to Andersson et al.

Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over JP 9-57,401 and Andersson et al., and further in view of the patent to Streubel et al.

Claims 4 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over JP 9-57,401 and Andersson et al., and further in view of JP 59-229,265.

In view of the Examiner's rejections of the claims, applicant has amended claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims now on file

particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended the claims to address the instances of indefiniteness pointed out by the Examiner.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is overcome and should be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims presently on file differ essentially and in an unobvious, highly advantageous manner from the constructions disclosed in the references.

Turning now to the references and particularly to JP 9-57401, it can be seen that this reference discloses an electromagnetic brake device for a continuous casting mold. The reference does not disclose or suggest a braking device constructed to produce a magnetic flux through the water tanks in which the magnetic parts of the core are mounted, as in the presently claimed invention.

He patent to Andersson et al. discloses a device for continuously casting in a mold.

The Examiner combined Andersson et al. with JP 9-57,401 in determining that claims 1 and 2 would be unpatentable over such a combination. Although Andersson et al. seems to teach fixing parts of the core in the water tank, there is no teaching of the water tanks having walls formed so as to accommodate the primary part of the core in the operating position at a certain distance from the broad-side walls, as in the presently claimed invention. There is no teaching in either reference of any modification of the water tank walls to accommodate the primary part of the core.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the above-discussed reference is overcome and should be withdrawn.

The remaining references which were cited in combination with JP 9-57401 in rejecting claims 3-9, have also been considered. Applicant respectfully submits that none of these references, nor their combination, teach an electromagnetic braking device as recited in the claims presently on file and as discussed above in connection with the rejection of the independent claim.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of claims 3-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are

HM-616

overcome and should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Any additional fees or charges required at this time in connection with this application may be charged to Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 11-1835.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Klaus P. Stoffel
Reg. No. 31,668

For: Friedrich Kueffner
Reg. No. 29,482
317 Madison Avenue, Suite 910
New York, New York 10017
(212) 986-3114

Dated: June 6, 2007

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on June 6, 2007.

By: 
Klaus P. Stoffel

Date: June 6, 2007